

BREAKOUT SESSION PROGRAM PLAN ACTIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2002

Track A – Coordination and integration of DOE line and independent oversight and contractor self-assessment under DOE Policy 450.5.

DOE Policy 450.5, “Line Environment, Safety and Health Oversight”

Purpose and Scope: To set forth the Department’s expectations for DOE line management ES&H oversight and for the use of contractor self-assessment programs as the cornerstone for this oversight.

Key Elements of the Policy:

- EH serves as a “compliment” to DOE line oversight
- It is the Department’s policy to conduct oversight in a cost-effective, coordinated, integrated, and efficient manner that is seamless to the contractors.
- A robust, rigorous, and credible contractor ES&H self-assessment program is in place.
- The results and conclusion of contractor self-assessments are available to DOE.
- As an effective contractor self-assessment program is established, the DOE oversight function transitions to:
 - Operational awareness of contractor activities
 - Review of performance metrics and contractor self-assessment program and results
 - Review and assessment of readiness reviews, safety management, and authorization bases.
 - Periodic value-added appraisals to confirm and validate safety performance and self-assessment program effectiveness.

A-1 Reducing Layers and Redundancy in DOE Oversight

Program Plan Actions

- III A. Use an integrated planning process that coordinates and schedules the oversight and other review activities in the field and in Headquarters on one schedule.
4. Consolidate these activities, collaborate on results, and use parallel review paths where possible.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can true integrated DOE oversight planning (as opposed to simply merging independently developed oversight schedules) that considers risk, performance, and scope, while reducing redundancy and overlap be accomplished?
2. Could the annual site program planning meetings, as conducted by the Office of Science, provide an opportunity for all DOE line and independent oversight organizations to accomplish effective integrated oversight planning including DOE consideration of risks, activities, performance, and priorities?

3. How can the areas of focus and schedules of external oversight organizations such as the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, OSHA, Office of Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, and states be more effectively factored into integrated oversight planning without impacting the independence of these organizations?
4. How can joint DOE (Headquarters: Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance, Office of Environment, Safety and Health; operations offices; and area offices) and even DOE contractor joint reviews be employed where feasible to increase effectiveness and efficiency, reduce redundancy and impact on mission, and share technical resources?
5. How can DOE oversight more effectively “complement” contractor self-assessment in accordance with DOE P 450.5 through mechanisms such as annual coordination with scheduled contractor assessments; focusing on areas not addressed by contractors or conducting evaluations in areas which the contractors lack technical resources or expertise?
6. How can DOE project and program site monitoring and review activities, which are considered by contractors to be “oversight,” be effectively and efficiently incorporated into this integrated oversight planning process?

Expertise, and Consideration of Key Factors Such as Risk, Vulnerabilities, Hazardous Activities, and Performance?

A-2 Coordinating line and independent oversight schedules program plan actions.

- III A. Use an integrated planning process that coordinates and schedules the oversight and other review activities in the field and Headquarters on one schedule:
1. Schedule the oversight and review activities of the contractor, DOE field office, and Headquarters program elements, as well as routine audits conducted by the Office of Inspector General, on an integrated plan.
 2. These activities should contain, as a minimum, assessments, reviews, authorization bases reviews and appraisals, and ORRs.
 3. Include resources for each scheduled activity.
 4. Require the field offices to keep the integrated schedule current and manage proposed changes.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can we generate a single consolidated annual DOE line and independent oversight schedule that reflects effective integrated oversight planning within the program offices (Headquarters), operations and areas offices, OA, EH, SO, etc.?
2. Can the consolidated annual DOE oversight schedule be coordinated or integrated with the formal contractor self-assessment schedule to prevent excessive overlap, assure adequate coverage, and reduce overall impact on site activities and resources?
3. Is it possible to better integrate the annual DOE oversight schedule including areas of focus and timing with scheduled external assessments conducted by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Office of Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, OSHA, or state agencies?
4. Is it possible to coordinate or combine the required annual DOE and contractor appraisals of ISM implementation including ISM verifications/updates, contract off ramp reviews, or ISMEs to increase efficiency, reduce impact, and directly share evaluation observations and reports?
5. How can we establish effective process for accommodating emerging for-cause oversight reviews based on occurrence reports, adverse performance trends, programmatic weaknesses, or management concerns, and that were not captured in annual oversight schedule including prioritization, staffing, scheduling, and operations manager control?
6. How can we assure that operations office managers have the lead for the generation of and control over the consolidated annual DOE oversight schedule for sites and facilities under their responsibility?

7. How can the role of the facility representatives in DOE oversight be clarified and incorporated effectively into the integrated oversight planning?

A-3 Voluntary accreditation of contractor self assessment programs

Program Plan Actions

III B. Use a measure of contractor performance to determine the level of oversight and review needed for contractors and DOE fieldwork.

1. (second quarter) – Define the concept of self-assessment accreditation as a means of grading DOE oversight; involve field and programs and benchmark against INPO, etc.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. Will accreditation of self-assessment programs, with an accompanying decrease in direct DOE oversight and focus on self-assessment program effectiveness and results by DOE, incentivize improvements in self-assessment and an increased contractor willingness to share self-assessment results with DOE?
2. How frequently and of what scope should DOE line and independent direct oversight of contractor programs and activities be conducted to “validate” self-assessment programs and results? How can other indications of self-assessment program performance be factored into the scope and frequency of DOE validation reviews (performance metrics, occurrence reports, enforcement, and trends)?
3. How can we apply the self-assessment accreditation process to sites with multiple contractors and subcontractors?
4. How should reaccreditation of contractor self-assessment programs be effectively and efficiently accomplished and how often?
 - 2, 3, or 4-year recertifications?
 - Automatic, based on self-assessment program implementation and timely and effective corrective actions
 - Automatic, based upon self-assessment and safety management performance as determined by performance metrics, occurrence reports and trends, and DOE line and independent oversight
 - Re-submittal of self-assessment program for accreditation board review and approval.
 - Any combination of the above.
5. Can the accreditation of contractor self-assessment programs by DOE and effective implementation and management response be effectively incentivized in contracts?

A-4: Focusing DOE oversight on contractor self-assessment and performance:

Program Plan Actions:

- III B. Use a measure of contractor performance to determine the level of oversight and review needed for contractors and DOE fieldwork.
1. Draw on performance measures to determine and vary the level of oversight and ES&H reviews needed for contractor and field activity (Draft performance management tools {metrics} that can be used to set priorities for line and independent oversight and review. See track C-2).
 2. As a minimum, use the effectiveness of self-assessment programs, results of VPP, ISM, and ISO 14001, effectiveness of corrective actions, and assessment of events that entail risk to determine needed reviews.
 3. Adopt methods that other agencies such as EPA, NRC, and OSHA use in leveraging programs to vary or reduce their oversight activities.
 4. Consider the type and level of risks of facilities or activities and past performance when planning DOE oversight and other ES&H activities.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution

1. What types of performance metrics or indicators would allow DOE to effectively monitor real-time or short-term contractor safety performance and decrease the need for direct observation of field safety performance? (coordinate with Session 3, Element 2).
2. How can DOE establish an environment that encourages contractors to share self-assessment results including reports, issues, and corrective actions without fear of overreaction including piling on of additional DOE line or independent assessments, enforcement, or financial penalties?
3. Under an accredited contractor self-assessment program, can DOE stand-back and allow the contractor to have the first opportunity to conduct diagnostic self-assessments in response to emerging performance problems as indicated by occurrences, performance metrics, external reviews, etc.
4. What methodologies can be effectively employed by DOE to monitor and assure effective implementation of accredited contractor self-assessment programs including scheduling, scope, implementation, and contractor management support and responsiveness to results?
5. When contractor self-assessment programs identify significant programmatic issues or weaknesses such as degrading facilities or infrastructure (systems and equipment), configuration management (drawings, design control, labeling), or procedure quality, how can we improve DOE responsiveness to the resource needs to resolve these issues or weaknesses including re-prioritization where warranted?

Track B – Tailoring Requirements, Standards and Authorization Basis to Changing or Differing DOE Missions and Activities

B-1 Eliminating Redundancy Between DOE Orders and Applicable Industry Standards

Moderator: Dick Black

Program Plan Actions:

V – Applicability of Requirements

V.A. Revise directives and guidance documents so that they are applicable to the various broad missions of environmental management, research, construction, and other non-defense related activities.

1. Group the directives and guidance in teams on their impact on safety and work efficiency.
2. Create small groups of personnel to review the directives and their guidance documents.
3. Based on priority, review directives for their applicability, usability and effective use to the various activities in the field.
4. Solicit comments on revised directives from contractors and field offices.
5. Document resolution of comments.

Questions for Discussion and Resolutions:

1. Can the experiences and lessons learned in DOE order industry requirements crosswalk pilots at Fernald, Sandia, and PNNL as well as the Kansas City Plant transition to industry standards effort be utilized to develop an effective and consistent approach or model(s) to be applied complex-wide.
2. Since most DOE orders, with the exception of the decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) order, were developed to support DOE operational activities. Do DOE orders need to be applied to shutdown facilities and D&D or can we employ an effective combination of safety performance objectives, a D&D authorization basis, and contractor shutdown/D&D Plan? (Reference EM 830 Review against shutdown facilities and United Kingdom D&D regulatory approach)
3. There have been complaints that those pre-proscriptive and excess “How-to’s” in DOE orders instead of performance objectives or the “Whats” – is there a basis for these complaints and can the “How-to’s” be removed to provide our contractors with more opportunity and flexibility to utilize their experience and innovation in assuring that safety and production performance objectives are met in an integrated, effective, and efficient manner?
4. How can we prevent directives “guidance” on personal performance expectations being imposed as requirements on contractors by DOE line or independent oversight personnel or consultants conducting assessments or investigations?

5. Applicable industry standards have in some cases in the past been endorsed, ordered, and imposed through reference in the DOE orders. As we eliminate redundant DOE orders, should the applicable industry requirements be specifically listed in contracts and subcontracts?
6. Once we have eliminated requirements that are redundant or that do not add value to safety management and performance, how can we avoid “order creep” back into the applicable set-up requirements for a contractor?

B-2 Streamlining Authorization Basis including tailoring to mission, hazards, and project duration non-prescriptive performance objectives, and a timely or efficient DOE review and approval process

Moderator: Shirley Olinger (RL)

Project Plan Actions:

V.B. Provide clarification where applicability of requirements is applicable

4. Develop guidance documents or acceptable interpretations of requirements for broad missions; e.g., Authorization Basis for waste storage on concrete pads or preventive maintenance at short-lived facilities.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can the results and lessons learned as well as the “Compliance Models” from the recent EM Review of the application of the 10 CFR 830 Nuclear Safety Rule to shutdown facilities be effectively employed to reduce requirements that do not add value to shutdown facility safety, to effectively tailor authorization bases to the activities and hazards, and to reduce costs and time at risk in shutdown facilities?
2. Can we develop a unique form of authorization bases for shutdown and D&D that is simpler to develop, quicker to review and approve, and that accomplishes the following objectives: (Reference United Kingdom D&D Authorization Basis approach)
 - Continue to bound remaining significant hazards, analysis and migrate as in the original operational authorization basis
 - Assures the identification and migration of the unique hazards to workers and the environment associated with shutdown, recovery, stabilization, and D&D.
 - Identifies and assures the availability of systems and equipment essential to safety and the migration of the unique hazards associated with shutdown and D&D actions.
 - Removes or reduces operational requirements that add little or minimal value to shutdown or D&D safety but that detract from efficiency, impact resources and impede progress in the reduction of risk.
3. How can we improve the process for maintaining authorization bases current to changing facility life cycle status, hazards, missions and material condition?
4. For authorization bases that apply to shutdown facilities and D&D, can we focus more on safety performance objectives (What’s) and less on prescriptive “How to’s” to provide contractors with more flexibility in applying their unique experience and innovative approaches while assuring safety objectives are met?
5. Can we simplify and shorten the DOE process for approving the downgrading of facility hazard classification as hazards are reduced in shutdown and D&D to eliminate requirements no longer needed, reduce costs and resources, and expedite reduction of

those at risk? Can this be accomplished by pre-identifying the point at which the hazard classification can be reduced?

B-3 Effectively employing a standards management program to achieve and maintain a standards – based safety system that fully integrates and tailors safety to differing missions and hazards, while eliminating excessive, complex, or redundant requirements that decrease efficiency and progress without adding value.

Moderator: Ken Powers and Barbara Mazurowski (NNSA/NV)

Project Plan Actions:

V. C. Improve the standards management processes.

1. Provide draft standards management directives for submission through the DOE directives management system.
2. Identify “consistency requirements” considered vital for DOE/NNSA corporate functionality.
3. Identify a means by which the field can obtain consistent interpretations of DOE order requirements.
4. Identify metrics that are workable to measure success.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution

1. Can we accept a re-engineered and streamlined WSS/SRID/Other (“Standards Management”) process that takes advantage of lessons learned and more current views? [possible presenter: Ken Powers (NNSA/NV)]
2. Can the standards management process be effectively applied to the identification of the appropriate set of DOE and industry standards for areas other than ES&H?
3. Are there certain DOE/NNSA consistency requirements that must be implemented for the department to function effectively? [possible presenter: Connie Soden (NNSA/AL)]
4. How can we establish a more centralized timely, and effective process for the consistent interpretation and clarification of DOE requirements?
5. How can we measure our success? [possible presenter: Michael Marelli (NNSA/NV)]

B-4 Moving toward “Self-governance” through the use of nationally recognized experts, commercial standards, and industrial standards and certifications.

Moderator: Les Shepard (SNL)

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. Under self-governance, what would be the role envisioned for DOE Headquarters and field management and how would DOE maintain cognizance of mission and safety performance on DOE mission-critical activities?
2. Should the implementation of self-governance be contingent on first achieving excellence in safety management and performance as well as a robust program effective, and accredited contractor self-assessment program?
3. For a number of years, some commercial nuclear plants experienced a very predictable cycle of degrading performance where they would be rated a SALP 1 (top performance) by the NRC resulting in a significant reduction in NRC regulatory oversight. Within 3 years, under reduced NRC presence, the performance of some of those plants would degrade to a SALP 3 (worst performance) and possibly even being placed on most dreaded NRC “Plant Watch List.” This cycle was attributed to many factors such as overconfidence, inadequate critical self-assessment, and shifting management attention and priorities. Under self-governance, the accompanying significant decrease in DOE presence and oversight and the historical infrequent oversight by organizations such as OSHA, how could degrading ES&H performance and a similar adverse cycle be avoided?
4. In recent assessments by independent organizations, certain sites have been identified where the WSS did not incorporate key DOE ES&H orders or equivalent industrial standards, and even more importantly, performance in these areas was degraded. How can we assure that the WSS set and performance metrics selected adequately support self-governance, performance-based management, and the stewardship of the DOE mission and assets?
5. Under self-governance, how would DOE be assured that the contractor continues to perform at the levels indicated by supporting certifications such as VPP certification, ISM verification, self-assessment accreditation, or ISO certification?
6. Is the basic philosophy of self-governance compliance with minimal DOE and industry regulations or one of continuous improvement towards excellence in ISM ES&H performance?

Track C – Improving the Contribution of Operating Experience, Performance Monitoring and Analysis, and Lessons Learned to Integrated Safety Management (Feedback for Improvement)

C-1 Re-engineering the occurrence reporting and processing system (ORPS) including linking cause codes to the ISM core functions, modifying reporting thresholds to reduce unnecessary reporting, and consolidating reporting systems.

Project Plan Actions:

V.I.A. Revise Existing Occurrence Reporting Requirements to Eliminate Nuisance Reporting.

1. Determine the expectations of ORPS and create a task force.
2. Revise occurrence reporting categories and data fields to also align with cleanup and science missions and expectations.
3. Change the reporting thresholds to eliminate nuisance reporting.
4. Involve field representations (such as facility representatives) early in the review and revision process.

V.1.B. Make a concerted effort to consolidate some of the various reporting systems

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can we revise the ORPS in a manner that balances the need to reduce nuisance reporting with the need to trend lower level events and near-misses as a leading indicator to prevent more serious events and accidents and to achieve continuous improvement in ISM?
2. How can we effectively replace outdated cause codes that focus on “symptoms” such as “inattention to detail” with cause codes that link to specific elements of the ISM core functions allowing us to trend ISM performance and achieve continuous improvements in programs, processes, and ISM?
3. What DOE reporting systems (ORPS, CAIRS, EOC, etc.) can be consolidated and what specific barriers must be overcome to accomplish this consolidation.
4. What specific mechanisms or approaches could be employed to simplify occurrence reporting while at the same time providing more value-added to DOE and contractor line managers in implementing ISM, achieving the DOE mission, and assuring the protection of workers, the public, and the environment?
5. What organizations should DOE benchmark against in effectively re-engineering ORPS:
 - Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO)?
 - Nuclear Regulatory Commission?
 - Naval Reactors?

- Dupont/General Electric?
- Chemical Industry?
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)?
- Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)?
- All of the above?

C-2 Tailoring Performance metrics to the needs of line management in prioritizing and allocating management attention and resources including the establishment and use of a “color annunciator rating system.”

Project Plan Actions:

III B Use of measure of contractor performance to determine the level of oversight and review needed for contractors and fieldwork.

1. Draw on performance measures to determine and vary the level of oversight and ES&H review needed for contractor and field activity. Draft performance management tools (metrics) that can be used to set priorities for line and independent oversight and review.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. The use of the colored annunciator-rating concept, intended to mimic the control room and local alarm panels in plants, has proven very successful in the commercial nuclear industry in monitoring performance, prioritizing management attention and resources, and achieving proactive and continuous improvement. How can this system be effectively employed across DOE with multiple sites, differing missions and hazards, and the DOE operating contractor relationship?
2. How can we best tailor these annunciator panels to serve the needs of DOE and contractor management at the facility, site operations/area office, Headquarters program office, and secretarial levels?
3. Nuclear utilities employing this annunciator system utilize a effective combination of quantitative performance metrics, algorithms, and best management judgment in determining the color rating each quarter (they would not, for example, just rely on the number of occurrence reports in a rating period but would consider the relative safety significance of the occurrences and performance trends. Can DOE and its contractors utilize a similar approach?
4. Would it be appropriate for our contractors to make an initial attempt at determining color ratings at the facility and site levels each quarter but then to accept constructive input from responsible DOE managers and facility representatives in selecting final ratings?
5. How can we effectively link the frequency, level, and focus of DOE line and independent oversight to this performance rating system to assure the most efficient use of these resources in achieving improvement while reducing direct DOE oversight within facilities, programs, systems, and safety management areas that are performing well?
6. In addition to the normal green, yellow, and red colors associated with these performance rating systems, should we employ a “blue” color to identify and share highly successful programs and best practices?

C-3 Taking amore corporate, consolidated, and efficient approach to identifying a resolving generic safety issues, technical issues, and performance problems that impact a large cross section of the DOE complex.

Program Plan Actions:

II C. To consolidate efforts and pool resources, move the major ES&H cross cutting functions of the various Headquarters program elements to EH as the lead organization.

- Many of the safety management or technical issues facing the Department today are long-standing and/or generic across the complex, and numerous attempts to resolve them have been isolated, fragmented, and very inefficient. Examples might include, for instance, our aging and degrading safety infrastructure; inadequate procedure quality or use; quality assurance; extensive and growing number of excess facilities in need of maintenance and surveillance or demolition; criticality safety; and tank aging and integrity. What specific suggestions do you have for taking a more collaborative and efficient corporate (complex-wide) approach to effective resolution of these safety management issues? Given the program plan action II C above, what would you view the role of EH in this effort?
- How can our DOE program offices, field offices, and site managers as well as our contractor managers work more collectively to synergistically address these generic issues including the necessary adjustment of priorities, sharing problems and successes, and the application of the necessary level of resources and funding?
- EH is proposing a process where the complex including DOE and contractor management and staff would focus on addressing one of these generic safety management issues on a quarterly or twice a year basis. This might include, as an example, an initial survey by EH of successful initiatives or programs that have had a level of success; an EH report providing examples of the issue as well as innovative initiatives and programs; the appointment of a DOE and contractor champion for resolution of the issue; combined DOE and contractor assessment of the area; and a combined effort throughout the period to resolve the issue including analysis, problem solving, adjustment of priorities and resources, poster campaigns, and a complex-wide workshop and training session. DOE you see value in this collaborative and focused approach to generic or chronic safety management issues? Suggestions?
- What would you list as the top 10 (in order of priority) generic or chronic safety management or technical issues facing the Department at this moment?
- In general, what would you list as the primary barriers to the effective resolution of these long-standing and complex-wide safety management issues?

Lack of adequate resources or funding	_____
Organizational or cultural resistance	_____
Absence of a coordinated approach	_____
Changes in administration or priorities	_____
Complexity of the issue	_____

Changes in contractor or management _____
Budget reductions _____
Other _____
All of the above _____

- In addition to issuing information notices to nuclear utilities on significant safety or technical issues, the NRC can issue generic letters that require the utilities to report back on their analysis and actions related to serious safety or technical issues that may affect multiple plants.
- Should DOE employ a similar approach for significant issues such a HEPA filter problems, leaking unlined fuel pools, or hazardous protection systems following the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory Carbon Dioxide Accident?

C-4 Improving the identification, dissemination, and implementation of “best practices” and lessons learned across the DOE complex.

Program Plan Actions:

- II.C To consolidate efforts and pool resources, move the major ES&H cross-cutting functions of the various Headquarters program elements to EH as the lead organization.
4. At a minimum, move the functions related to identification of operating experience and lessons learned and detailed analysis of occurrence reporting.
- VI.C. Integrate into one group in EH the coordination of data from operating experience, analysis of operating trends, and the INPO interface.
1. Implement one effective, complex-wide operating experience and performance trending in EH. Establish a task force to identify methods to communicate best practices and lessons learned related to ISMs.
 2. Benchmark the INPO operating experience program.
 3. Perform data analysis and trending and share with the complex.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. Examples of successful programs, noteworthy practices, innovative initiatives, and valuable lessons learned are evident across the complex, and yet one of the most frequently asked questions is “who has a good program” or “who is doing this right.” Given the many challenges and barriers such as geographical separation, separate program and field offices, multiple contractors and subcontractors, and widely varying mission, activities, and hazards, how can we improve the sharing and level of safety management benefit from this information?
2. How much value would you rate each of the following mechanisms for potentially improving the sharing of successful programs, noteworthy practices, innovative initiatives, or lessons learned:

	(low)	1	2	3	4	5	(high)
Workshops	___						
Bulletins	___						
Videos	___						
Focused, coordinated efforts (element 3 above)	___						
“Blue” color rating (see element below)	___						
Use of “champions”	___						
Lessons learned reports	___						
Networking	___						
Other	_____						

3. Despite the existence of a number of excellent lessons learned programs and organizations, numerous accident and event investigations indicate a failure to effectively utilize and implement the lessons learned from precursor events and accidents including problems such as very narrow applications to a very specific site, facility, activity, or location or a focus on resolving symptoms rather than programmatic or safety management improvements. What are the major barriers to the acceptance and implementation and what can be done to improve management implementation and accountability for the effective identification, dissemination, application, and implementation of applicable lessons learned?
4. EH has produced lessons learned videos for two recent serious accidents that seem to have generated increased interest and response. Would you see value in increased use of video taping of accident root causes or re-enactments to the dissemination and implementation of lessons learned?
5. EH is in the process of establishing a central data base to capture best practices, exemplary programs and processes and innovative initiatives. Would you view this database as useful and how can we provide the information to keep this database current and useful to line management?

C-5 – Familiarization of ISSM basics, its implementation (pitfalls and experiences) across the Department in DOE and NNSA sites, tools that can be used to begin or enhance an existing program, and resources and personnel available to assist attendees with their ISSM program.

Project Plan Actions:

1. Assess the following options:
 - Incorporating/crosswalking ISSM EC/SSMIT initiatives into the “Project Plan for Safety Management Report and Executive Safety Conference” for corporate/unified reporting to foster the pathway to Integrated Management (IM)
 - Identifying ISM participants for ISSM Executive Council (EC) and/or Safeguards and Security Management Integration Team (SSMIT) membership to strengthen technical diversity and line management ownership and/or assess the need of a new team to design the Department’s IM strategy
 - Solicit feedback from ISM participants on recommended course corrections, ISM lessons learned for ISSM consideration and implementation, and partnership opportunities to attain an overarching, robust management system (i.e., IM system)
2. Identify other forums and areas of opportunity to integrate security into mission work.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can the ISM community help with ISSM implementation?
2. How can we most effectively integrate ISM and ISSM initiatives to get to IM?
3. How may local sites be given the authority to apply existing management processes (work smart standards) to safeguards and security controls?

4. What are the barriers to ISSM success and how may the ISM community help?
5. What are the benefits of ISM/ISSM partnering and what actions should be taken to capitalize on the benefits?
6. How can we effectively balance safety and security so that they complement, rather than adversely impact, one another under ISM and ISSM, particularly in this post-September 11 environment?
7. How can we assure health and safety within safeguards and security operations under the prolonged state of alert following September 11?
 - Extensive overtime for protective force
 - Continuing risk and threat
 - Heightened state of awareness and anticipation
 - Increased performance testing and expectations
8. How can emergency planning and management be modified to assure maintaining, as appropriate, a balance between safety and security under emergency conditions including response to terrorist threats or actions?
9. How can we begin to merge ISM and ISSM into the line organizations such that all decisions include ISM and ISSM.

Track D - Improving the contribution of contracts and subcontracts to the effective and efficient implementation of Integrated Safety Management.

D-1 Effectively applying the principles of Integrated Safety Management (ISM) to the procurement process and writing of contracts and subcontracts including roles and responsibilities, experience and competence, hazards analysis, performance expectations and metrics, and incentives and accountability.

Program Plan Actions:

IV.A. Improve the contribution of contracts to the effective implementation of ISM.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can we limit contract and subcontract requirements to those that focus on expected performance outcomes and allow contractors more latitude and flexibility in determining how to meet these outcomes?
2. How can we provide better incentives and rewards for effective implementation of the principles and core functions of ISM including strong safety management, model programs, innovative work practices, and excellent safety performance?
3. How can we revise the contract and subcontract “killer clause” to assure the accountability for safety management performance while assuring that overall and prior performance is considered when reacting to isolated occurrences or adverse performance?
4. How can contracts and subcontracts be written to assure that the five core functions of ISM are applied in the conduct of all potentially hazardous work and activities as well as achieve full and effective accountability for the failure to do so?
5. The DOE use of fixed-price contracts has frequently been criticized, including most recently in an IG report, for failing to achieve the predicted savings in cost, to assure that DOE clearly identifies the level of hazard and work, to assure adequate incorporation of safety requirements and oversight, or the expected objectives (Pit 9, Hanford Tank Farms, etc.). How can DOE more effectively apply the principles and core functions of ISM in determinations whether to use fixed-price contracts, including complete analysis and communication of work and hazards, provision for incorporation of safety requirements and oversight, and performance metrics for accountability?
6. How can we provide better incentives in RFP’s, contracts and subcontracts to attract the best-in-class, safest, and most experienced contractors and subcontractors to perform DOE work and to compete with private industry for their services?

D-2 Effective utilization of contracts to manage and oversee contractor and subcontractor performance, including the effective and efficient integration of safety management with mission accomplishment.

Program Plan Actions:

I.X.A. Improve the contribution of contracts to effective implementation of ISM.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. If key goals are to: 1) decrease DOE direct oversight of contractor and subcontractor work and 2) increase DOE management of contracts (including monitoring performance metrics and contractor self assessment), how can we better utilize the current ISM contract requirement to update safety performance objectives, measures and commitments annually as the basis for DOE performance monitoring and oversight?
2. Can the performance objectives and work commitments form the basis for one set of measurable metrics satisfactory to DOE project, line, and independent oversight?
3. Can DOE establish a mechanism that helps to ensure sufficient funding is available to the contractor and tracked to meet safety objectives and commitments?
4. What remedies should be provided contractually when performance metrics indicate declining contractor or subcontractor performance or repetitive or chronic performance problems not resolved on a timely basis by contractor self assessment?
5. How can DOE make better use of fee provisions and “off-ramps” in cases where contractors fail to implement effective self assessment programs, provide adequate oversight and supervision of subcontractor safety performance, or respond on a timely basis to safety issues, events or trends, self assessment findings, or to adverse performance metrics?
6. With the increasing use of subcontractors for short-term activities such as D&D, environmental cleanup, and new construction, how can we better use contracts and subcontracts to assure that site contractors are held responsible and accountable for assuring subcontractor safety performance including working within their ISM system?
7. How can DOE and its contractors better monitor subcontractor safety performances, including the application of the ISM functions to all work activities and compliance with all applicable safety requirements and controls? How can we utilize contracts/subcontracts to assure that equipment and materials brought onsite by subcontractors is safety and in adequate material condition including maintenance, testing, inspection and control of modifications?
8. How can we better employ contracts and particularly subcontracts, to assure that DOE is provided with essential information reflective of contractor and subcontractor safety performance including occurrence reports, injuries, and lost-work days and worker exposures to radiological or chemical materials?

D-3 Implementing best practices to ensure subcontractor safety. Discussion and outcomes will address: implementation of best practices across the DOE-complex to ensure subcontractors conduct work safely (end of 3rd quarter 2002), EFCOG role and responsibilities, a system to facilitate contractor senior management involvement and accountability for implementing best practices on a continuous basis after 2002.

V. C. Improve the efficiency of the exemption/waiver processes and communication revisited and approved exemptions/waivers throughout the complex.

I.X. A. Improve the contribution of contracts and subcontracts to the effective implementation of ISM.

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. How can we improve the clarity and understanding of DOE performance requirements, expectations, and metrics in contracts and subcontracts?
2. Should applicable industry standards utilized in lieu of DOE orders and directives be explicitly listed in contract B lists?
3. Is it possible and desirable to replace the explicit DOE and industry requirements in contract B lists with non-prescriptive safety performance objectives that encourage contractors to fully utilize experience and innovation in achieving safe, effective, and efficient mission accomplishments. (reference: United Kingdom Nuclear Installation Inspectorate 36 license conditions)
4. Can standard contract B lists be developed for major and diverse DOE/NNSA missions, activities, hazards, and project durations:
 - Decontamination and decommissioning (EM)
 - Waste management, packaging, and transportation (EM)
 - Research and development (SC)
 - Reactor operations (NE)
 - Nuclear weapons operations and research and development (NNSA)
 - Fossil energy operations and research and development (FE)
5. How will contracts and B lists be modified to reflect a transition to industry standards, self governess, and to external regulation?
6. How can we improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the DOE exemption/waiver process and the communication of approved exemptions/waivers across the DOE complex (See Track B)?

D-4 Improving the dissemination, sharing, and implementation of contracting lessons learned, best practices, and innovative initiatives across the DOE complex.

Program Plan Actions:

I.X.A Improve the contribution of contracts to the effective implementation of ISM

Questions for Discussion and Resolution:

1. What would be the most effective mechanism(s) to disseminate and share contracting best practices and lessons learned?
 - EH best practices database
 - Lessons learned bulletins
 - Lessons learned workshops
 - Procurement and contract training courses
 - Lessons learned videos
2. Who should “lead” organization for the dissemination of lessons learned and best practices associated with contracting?
 - MA?
 - EH?
 - Program Offices?
 - OMB?
 - Other?
3. Beyond this ISM forum, how can we most effectively disseminate and share the results and lessons learned from the 2002 contract reform pilots and initiatives?
4. Should the best practices and lessons learned from this 2002 safety strategy, pilots, and the project plan actions be utilized to revise and improve existing contracts and subcontracts?
5. How can we effectively utilize the best practices and lessons learned from the 2002 safety strategy, pilots, reform initiatives, and the project plan actions to revise and upgrade DOE orders, policy, and guidance on procurement and contracting?